

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 3-4, 6, 10, and 12 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 1, 6 and 12 are amended, and claims 5, 8-9, 11, and 13 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter is added. Support for the claims can be found throughout the specification, including the original claims, and the drawings. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Examiner and his supervisor are thanked for the courtesies extended to Applicant's representatives during the October 30, 2007 personal interview. The points discussed are incorporated herein.

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 3-6, and 8-13 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Independent claim 1 has been amended to address the Examiner's comments, and independent claim 5 has been canceled. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 4-6, 12, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Watkins, U.S. Patent No. 2,116,370 in view of DE3221073 (hereinafter "DE '073"). Claims 5 and 13 have been cancelled. The rejection is respectfully traversed in so far as it applies to the remaining claims.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to more clearly recite the claimed at least one support frame and at least one cover bracket. That is, independent claim 1 has been amended to

recite, *inter alia*, at least one support frame in the shape of an inverted “L” hingedly connected at a lower end to a rear surface of the door thereby creating a hinge connection to allow the door to pivot about the lower end of the door and allow a storage box for storing an object to be seated behind the door, and at least one cover bracket protruding backward from the rear surface of the door at a position adjacent to and outward of the at least one support frame and hinge connection, wherein when the door is pivoted, the cover bracket shields the hinge connection and at least a part of the support frame and blocks access from an outside of the door to the hinge connection. Watkins and DE ‘073, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least such features, or the claimed combination of features.

That is, Watkins discloses a file cabinet with a tilting front for a file drawer. Element 7, corresponded by the Examiner to the claimed at least one support frame, is a side wall of a drawer 3 and is not in the shape of an inverted “L” as claimed. Watkins fails to disclose or suggest at least one cover bracket protruding backward from the rear surface of the door at a position adjacent to and outward of the at least one support frame and hinge connection, wherein when the door is pivoted, the cover bracket shields the hinge connection and at least a part of the support frame and blocks access from an outside of the door to the hinge connection.

Further, DE ‘073 fails to overcome the deficiencies of Watkins. That is, DE ‘073 merely discloses a drawer having two side walls 2 and a front plate 5 pivotally attached to the side walls 2. Element 9 disclosed by DE ‘073 as a hinged plate and asserted by the Examiner as

Reply to Office Action of August 6, 2007

corresponding to the claimed at least one cover plate is part of the hinge connection. See Fig. 1 of DE '073 and the corresponding disclosure. Thus, it is not positioned adjacent to and outward of a support frame and hinge connection. Further, DE '073 does not disclose or suggest that the cover bracket shields the hinge connection and at least a part of the support frame and blocks access from an outside of the door to the hinge connection when the door is pivoted. Thus, DE '073 provides no teaching for modifying Watkins as proposed by the Examiner to produce the claimed features of independent claim 1.

Applicant's at least one cover bracket is provided in such a way as to protect users, especially children, from injuring fingers. By the hinge connection and at least part of the support frame being shielded by the cover bracket when the door pivots, a user cannot put his/her fingers into a triangular space formed by the rear surface of the door, the front surface of the support frame, and the hinge connection. Hence, users are not able to touch the hinge connection, and are thereby protected from injury.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 is allowable over the applied combination, and thus, the rejection of independent claim 1 should be withdrawn. Dependent claims 4, 6, and 12 are allowable at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 1, from which they depend, as well as for their added features.

The Office Action rejected claims 3, 8, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Watkins and DE '073 in view of Jenkins, U.S. Patent No. 5,487,239. Claims 8 and 9 have been cancelled. The rejection is respectfully traversed in so far as it applies to claim 3.

Dependent claim 3 is allowable over Watkins and DE '073 at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 1, from which it depends, as well as for its added features. Jenkins fails to overcome the deficiencies of Watkins and DE '073, as Jenkins is merely cited for allegedly teaching a door basket. Accordingly, the rejection of dependent claim 3 over Watkins, DE '073, and Jenkins should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claims 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Meek, U.S. Patent No. 2,711,944 in view of Watkins and DE '073. Claim 11 has been cancelled. The rejection is respectfully traversed in so far as it applies to claim 10.

Dependent claim 10 is allowable over Watkins and DE '073 at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 1, from which it depends, as well as for its added features. Meek fails to overcome the deficiencies of Watkins and DE '073, as Meek is merely cited for disclosing a refrigerator. Accordingly, the rejection of dependent claim 10 over Watkins, DE '073, and Jenkins should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 5, and 12-13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Watkins in view of Jacobs, U.S. Patent No. 2,731,319. Claims 5 and 13 have been cancelled. The rejection is respectfully traversed in so far as it applies to the remaining claims.

As set forth above, Watkins fails to disclose or suggest all of the claimed features of independent claim 1, or the claimed combination. In particular, Watkins at least fails to disclose or suggest at least one support frame in the shape of an inverted "L" hingedly connected at a

lower end to a rear surface of the door thereby creating a hinge connection to allow the door to pivot about the lower end of the door and allow a storage box for storing an object to be seated behind the door, and at least one cover bracket protruding backward from the rear surface of the door at a position adjacent to and outward of the at least one support frame and hinge connection, wherein when the door is pivoted, the cover bracket shields the hinge connection and at least a part of the support frame and blocks access from an outside of the door to the hinge connection.

Jacobs fails to overcome the deficiencies of Watkins. That is, Jacobs discloses a utility bin 28 provided in a base cabinet 10. A door 22 is secured by hinges 24 to a side flange 26 of a front wall 18 of the base cabinet 10. The door 22 conceals the bin 28 when it is shut. Thus, Jacobs also fails to disclose or suggest at least one cover bracket protruding backward from the rear surface of the door at a position adjacent to and outward of the at least one support frame and hinge connection, wherein when the door is pivoted, the cover bracket shields the hinge connection and at least a part of the support frame and blocks access from an outside of the door to the hinge connection. Further, the side walls 36, which the Examiner correspond to the claimed at least one cover bracket are part of the utility bin 22, and thus, do not shield the hinge connection and at least a part of the support frame and block access from an outside of the door to the hinge connection when the door is opened. Thus, Jacobs provides no teaching for modifying Watkins as proposed by the Examiner to produce the claimed features of independent claim 1.

Thus, the rejection of independent claim 1 over Watkins and Jacobs should be withdrawn. Dependent claim 12 is allowable over Watkins and Jacobs at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 1, from which it depends, as well as for its added features. Accordingly, the rejection of dependent claim 12 over Watkins and Jacobs should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this,

Serial No. **10/801,565**

Docket No. **IK-0084**

Reply to Office Action of August 6, 2007

concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP



Carol L. Druzback
Registration No. 40,287

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
703 766-3777 CLD:HDG:tlg

Date: December 6, 2007

\\Fk4\Documents\2047\2047-083\132086.doc

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610